



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/500,577

12/27/2004

Joseph W. Villard

6100-009

5236

29335 7590 09/22/2009  
ROSENBAUM & ASSOCIATES, P.C.  
650 DUNDEE ROAD  
SUITE #380  
NORTHBROOK, IL 60062

EXAMINER

BOR, HELENE CATHERINE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3768

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/22/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

scotugno@biopatentlaw.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/500,577	<b>Applicant(s)</b> VILLARD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> HELENE BOR	<b>Art Unit</b> 3768	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) HELENE BOR. (3) PETER PAREDES.

(2) ERIC WINAKUR. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 17 September 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,22,63-71 and 79-81.

Identification of prior art discussed: Loeb (USPN 4,448,188); Rameshraj et al. journal article.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  
The Applicant presented the submitted proposed (see attached) amendments and discussed the differences between the prior art of record and the invention of the Applicant. The Examiner provided comments regarding the proposed amendments. The Applicant agreed to take those comments into consideration when filing a response.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Eric F Winakur/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3768	
---	--